

No. 96 AUGUST 1976

Spearhead

15p

COVENTRY March 1976
986 votes

CARSHALTON March 1976
1,851 votes

ROTHERHAM June 1976
1,696 votes

THURROCK July 1976
3,255 votes

**NATIONAL FRONT
VOTERS TERRIFY
CORRUPT
OLD PARTIES**

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Contrasts

Admirable is the only way one can describe the action of Israeli commandos in staging their lightning raid to free their co-racials held as hostages by a terrorist gang at Entebbe Airport, Uganda.

The question of violation of Ugandan territorial sovereignty is not worthy of consideration. It is perfectly clear that the Ugandan authorities were, at best, incompetent to deal with the situation and, at worst, positively giving aid and comfort to the terrorists. So far as the Israelis were concerned, their own people — Jews — were in danger; it was their duty to act; and they acted — efficiently, courageously and ruthlessly to protect their own people and deal with those threatening them.

Our praise for the Israelis in this respect has nothing to do with any attitude we may have on the rights and wrongs of the Palestine question. We happen to believe that on that question the Palestinian Arabs are right and

the Israelis wrong. This does not prevent us from admiring the latter who, naturally and properly from their point of view believing in their own cause, did the only possible thing in the situation and, from all accounts, did it supremely well.

Pathetic is, on the other hand, the only thing we can say about the moralistic protests emitting forth from the Government and other agencies in Britain against the execution of British mercenaries by Angola. Pathetic, not because the executions were right — not because they were anything other than brutal and barbarous — but pathetic only in so far as they betray both the naivety and impotence of people in Britain over the matter.

Naivety because it almost sounds as if people are shocked, that is to say surprised, at the executions. They should not have been for two reasons: one is that the Angolans are Communists; the other is that they are Africans. Because they are those things, the very idea that they should ever have been expected to act according to civilised standards is ludicrous in its simplicity.

The impotence consists, of course, of issuing pleas on behalf of the mercenaries without the force to back them up. Here the contrast between the modern day British and the Israelis is a stark and depressing one. One can bet that, had the imprisoned mercenaries been Jewish, all the considerable power of World Jewry in its many facets would have been concentrated towards putting pressure on Angola for their release and that this would not have excluded the possibility of some similar commando operation as was mounted at Entebbe.

But because Britain is today ruled by prissy liberalistic wets, totally lacking in the will to protect our country's interests and

citizens, we can only express ourselves in diplomatic messages — messages which no doubt caused hilarious laughter in the quarters where they were received.

End in sight?

The latest confidence trick to be perpetrated by the Government on the immigration issue is a propaganda campaign to convince the British people that the end of the coloured invasion is in sight.

In this ploy the Government has been aided by the media, which in mass readership newspapers like the *Sun* and the *Daily Mirror* splashed headlines such as "Final Two Years For Immigration" and "Once and For All Register to Stem Migrant Tide". A superficial reading of such articles, with their promising headlines, might have given the unsuspecting reader the impression that there was some plan afoot to end coloured immigration for good. Far from it.

What it all amounted to was that the entire forty thousand remaining East African Asians would be admitted to Britain within two years. Buried deep in the *Daily Mirror* article was the paragraph: "After that there will be no more to come from that area".

In other words, the hundreds of thousands (in fact almost half a million) Asians from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh will still be flooding into Britain. All that will have ended will be Asian immigration from East Africa because the whole population will have been allowed in.

That was the "Final Two Years For Immigration"!

Liberal leadership farce

The contest for the leadership of the Liberal party was rather like one of those silly, vicious scraps between two girls in the school playground — in fact nothing more than one has come to expect from the buffoons of that organisation.

An indication of the high level of political dialogue carried on by Messrs Steele and Pardoe were the accusations and counter-accusations that one candidate wore a secret hair-piece and that the other disguised his low stature by wearing platform shoes! John Pardoe proceeded to make an even bigger fool of himself by posing rather ludicrously as a fire-breathing "anti-Establishment" radical which successfully lost him the election.

The whole pathetic episode somehow encapsulated for public scrutiny the nature of the Liberal party — silly, trifling people arguing about silly, trifling things, and all of them affecting a brand of pseudo left-wing radicalism intended to obscure the total lack of any sound policies for the cure of Britain's ills that might attract the electorate.

The ditching of Jeremy Thorpe in favour of one of these two twerps will do

S P E A R H E A D

No. 96 AUGUST 1976

Office: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex (Tel: 01-977 2452)

Publisher: John Tyndall

Editor: Richard Verrall B.A. Contributing Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.


Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.



Contending twerps

nothing to arrest the declining fortunes of the Liberal party, which becomes increasingly irrelevant in British politics. There is indeed a place for a third party, but only one whose policies offer a genuinely radical alternative, and which get to the heart of Britain's decline.

Beating inflation

There can be few better vindications of the National Front's economic and financial policies than the success of the Rhodesian economy. The National Front and this journal have consistently advocated a policy of the greatest self-sufficiency in the production of manufactured goods as a basis of industrial recovery. We have further advocated that the root solution to the problem of inflation is to control the flow of credit into the economy so as to maintain a balance between money in circulation and goods and services available.

Recently Dr. D.C. Krogh, Governor of the Reserve Bank of Rhodesia, explained why Rhodesia had done so well in face of the world inflationary trend. His explanation was that the private sector had achieved "internal replacement and manufacture and so made Rhodesia more self-sufficient", and that "more goods were produced and credit kept pace with this increase and did not more than match it. If it did more than that you would have had inflation".

Because Rhodesia had to do it, she proved that it can be done.

Origins of rough justice

We have already made reference to the trial of mercenaries in Angola. The executions were unquestionably no more than legalised murder, especially as two of the executed men had not even fired a shot in Angola and no evidence of crimes was offered against them.

More to the point, however, was the farcical nature of this political "trial". It was yet one more case of a wholly illegal jurisdiction being exercised, over soldiers who should have been treated as prisoners of war, and who were arraigned on entirely bogus charges since it is not a crime anywhere to be a mercenary.

Justice is a thing of precedent, even mock justice. The Angolan farce was made possible only by Western precedent at Nuremberg, in which soldiers were executed by victors without legal jurisdiction and for 'crimes' which were declared to be crimes only after they had been committed; and by the Eichmann trial, when Israel, a state not in existence during World War Two, illegally kidnapped a German in Argentina and presumed to try him for 'crimes' which did not exist when they were allegedly committed.

Can we really expect Africans to behave any better?

Racial threat to schools

Two items of news, which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* within two days of each other, highlighted the fundamental changes being brought about in Britain through multi-racialism.

It was reported that the number of pupils is falling so rapidly because of the declining birthrate that some schools will have to be closed or sold off, according to the Department of Education and Science. The fall is expected to continue over the next ten years, resulting in a decrease of over 1 million children in school.

Ironically this story had just been preceded by a report headlined "Time Ripe for Changes in School Religion", according to which the Free Church Federal Council had advocated a new style of religious education. They claimed that since Britain was now flooded with Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs and other religious groups, the 1944 Education Act imposing Christian teaching was out

of date, and that Christianity "was now only one among the religions of the world that children had to try and understand".

So there you have it. While the number of white children in school dwindles, their places are taken by the children of the immigrant hordes whose pagan religions are now to become part of our national religious education syllabus.

Just one more glimpse of what "multi-racialism" means in practise.

Race-mixing for you, not me

As the first item of this month's editorial demonstrates, *Spearhead* gives praise where it is due. Equally we shall offer criticism where that is due also. Some months ago we featured an article drawing attention to the unmistakable double standards of the Jewish community on the race issue, according to which that community practises the strictest racial exclusiveness itself (which it has every right to do and which practise we admire), while at the same time it is frequently to be seen in the forefront of the equalitarian, racial integration movement amongst other peoples.

While the Jewish community in Britain recently announced plans to work with immigrant organisations to oppose "racialism" and promote integration, we hear that Rabbi Raymond Apple of Sydney, Australia has pleaded with Jewish youngsters not to marry non-Jews: "We simply cannot afford to lose such a high proportion of our people if we wish Jewry, with its values and heritage, to survive . . . We crucially need the loyalty of every Jew".

We have nothing but praise for this determined effort to preserve the heritage of race. All we ask is why this noble principle is not seen by the Jewish community as the right of others too?

British as vot you are

Morning Star Reporter

SOCIALISM is as native to our islands as the rose and the oak says a new Communist Party pamphlet "Britain Needs Socialism" by assistant general secretary Reuben Falber.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A. K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

The "Myth of Racial Purity"...

A SIMPLE LESSON IN PICTURES FOR THE
NEW STATESMAN AND THE UNDER-FIVES.

□ The Nazi-like myth of racial purity – tell it to the royal family! – was also a theme of at least one speaker, Lord Barnby, in a debate on immigration last week in the House of Lords. He concluded a somewhat discursive speech with the poignant words: 'Mixed blood is a sad thing. Those who know the West Indies have seen it . . . God forbid that we should see a big extension of that situation in this noble land of ours, which has had purity of blood for generations, and which wants to maintain it for the benefit of posterity.'

An intelligent Tory, Lord Colville of Culross, also helped to get the subject into proportion: 'For many centuries, we . . . have built up a reputation for providing a welcome and a home for peoples of very different origins from all over the world. In turn we have as a nation reaped a harvest of enrichment from that hospitality.' It is a familiar point; but with people like Mr Robert Relf of Leamington around – he used to belong to the Ku-Klux-Klan – it is necessary to make it again and again.

New Statesman, July 2nd, 1976.



Fig. 1. Royalty, 1540. (Elizabeth I)



Fig. 2. Royalty, 1960. (Elizabeth II)



Fig. 3.



Fig. 4.

NB. Anyone who detects a similarity (indicating racial homogeneity or "purity") between Figs. 1, 2 and 3, and a significant difference between these and Fig. 4, should write for an explanation to The Editor, *The New Statesman*, Great Turnstile, London WC1.

ROBERT GREGORY

IN DEFENCE OF NATIONALISM

"NATIONALISM is one of the main causes of war. Nationalism is out of date. We should all be internationalists now — citizens of the world." Such statements as these have become common today — the recognised slogans of internationalist hypocrisy and cant. These statements, made on the public platform or in newspaper articles, are generally the pronouncements of individuals who belong to nations which have had the right to nationhood for so many centuries that it appears to them no longer threatened; or of people who give allegiance to no nation, either because such does not exist or is of recent creation, but who rather aim to destroy such 'anachronisms' in the name of the 'progressive' notion of internationalism.

The former group are invariably the tools of the latter, who use their gullibility, naivete, self-guilt and opportunism in order to further the ultimate aims of the internationalist — the elimination of the nation-state and its replacement by a World Government controlled by a small elite. In order to weaken the nation-state the above slogans are used to implant the idea in the minds of the innocent that the Nation and the emotion engendered by it, nationalism, are not only anachronistic but positively evil and responsible for the greatest atrocities in history.

The idea that Nationalism is one of the main causes of war is false. War is not caused by nationalism but by the lust for domination, in which the possessions of others, material, cultural and spiritual, are seen as instruments for increasing one's own power. Power based on the domination of others is the principal cause of war; such power has always been the antithesis of nationalism because it crushes individual nations into dust in its relentless drive for total domination. The conquests of the Arabs in the seventh century, the Mongols in the thirteenth century, the Ottoman Turks in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the Communists in the twentieth century have all been motivated by the unquenchable desire for domination. Genuine nationalism does not lead to what may be described as a warped type of imperialism but is rather an answer, perhaps the only answer to such an evil creed. If it were not for the existence of nationalism large states would long since have seized all the smaller nations of the world, destroying both their culture and national identity. Had it not been for the nationalist spirit there would have been today no Great Britain, no France, no Spain, no Rhodesia and so on; the world would have been poorer without their distinctive cultures and political systems.

Militant nationalism is the answer to the lust for domination, the warped imperialism pursued today by the Internationalist-Communist alliance. Nationalism is the force that acts as a moral challenge to all the evils inherent in such an alliance, the lust for power, the greed for material enrichment even at the cost of bringing impoverishment and starvation to the rightful inhabitants of a nation, and the tyranny of physical might which would enslave smaller nations to its will, denying them every kind of liberty and taking from them their distinctive identity. Nationalism is a people's defence against enslavement and theft — theft of its material, cultural and spiritual possessions. Nationalism stands for liberty and respect for other people's right to their own culture and identity. Genuine nationalism recognises the value of nationhood; whereby the differences among peoples are acknowledged and groups are allowed to develop at their own pace and of their own accord; in which other cultures are studied but where the differences between them are accepted and emphasised, not ignored or disguised; in which the nation, in common with other nations, preserves its character and its special qualities by developing within itself — not by polluting itself in a racial mixture whose end result would be to destroy its identity.

NATIONALISM PREFERS PEACE

Because, as a rule, a nation can best preserve and develop its national culture and political system when peace reigns, it is in the interest of nationalism to avoid war, not to provoke it. Yet this does not mean that nationalism should be other than vigilant in the nation's defence. Nationalism by its nature prefers peace. It engages in war to defend the liberty of its people and the integrity of the nation. It is those that violate the principle of nationalism who provoke war — at the present time the Internationalist-Communist Alliance.

Internationalists pride themselves on having made a great "moral advance" in repudiating allegiance to their own nation (if such exists), and are therefore scornful of nationalism and those who persist in calling themselves nationalists. It has been conveniently ignored by them that one might as well argue the necessity of discarding ones family before one can become a 'loyal' citizen of a larger unit e.g. the nation. Yet few responsible people would state that because family devotion can, under certain conditions, exclude wider loyalties, families should be abolished — although a few cranks

and degenerates corrupted by liberal-masochism at its most vile have indeed hailed such an event as another "moral advance". Just as the family is the unit of the nation, so is the nation the unit of the world; as a nation would be the poorer without its families, so would the world be poorer without its separate nations, with all their wealth and variety of individual character, history and tradition — a tapestry of achievement with which to instil pride and hope for the future.

Nationality is to the nation what personality is to the individual. Just as the individual personality cannot develop along its own lines but is fettered and cramped in mind and soul when enslaved by the domination of another person, so the individual nation cannot healthily develop along its own national lines, or indeed long survive when it is enslaved by those motivated purely by the lust for power and domination, which is all that lies behind the pious pleas for internationalism.

Liberty is essential to both individuals and nations. Liberty to work, live and associate with those of similar background and culture and not to be forced either into association with those of totally alien origins and culture or be driven deeper into the nations heartland to escape the invasion of such alien groups in the nation's cities. Liberty, to express opinions concerning the well-being and future of the nation and to attack those who threaten that future, particularly those associated with that sinister alliance whose aim is to eliminate the nation-state and destroy the identity of the race. Liberty, to preserve what is finest in the nation's tradition while accepting the need for change — not for its own sake, or for the sake of some 'liberal' or 'progressive' idea, but rather because change is deemed necessary for the well-being of the nation.

In essence, the ideal should be a worldwide group of sovereign nations, all developing in their own way and with their own qualities — qualities which should be recognised and cultivated rather than reduced to a degenerate polyglot mass in the name of 'freedom' and 'equality' while in fact being manipulated by evil and destructive forces motivated solely by a lust for power. That is why a militant nationalism is necessary for Britain, for it is only through such uncompromising vigilance that we can defend the principle of nationhood — the basis of liberty.

Show the Flag

FLAGS, ROSETTES,
POLES ETC.

SEND STAMP FOR LIST

W. BROWN, 20 SUTTON WAY,
HESTON, MIDDX, TW5 0JA

Reprinted in an abridged form from an address delivered to the Citizens' Council of America, with acknowledgements to THE CITIZEN.

I HAVE been asked to discuss with you tonight the grave social and biological problem presented by that noisy band of persons who currently call themselves "liberal intellectuals". It is not a new problem. The contemporary specimens have inherited the whole of their little stock of phrases and notions, which they are pleased to call "ideas", from their predecessors in the 18th Century, when they called themselves *philosophes*, since France was the country in which they were then making the most noise. But they represent a biological tendency which you can trace back historically until you see that it is much older than civilization itself.

Now, a serious examination of the problem of "liberal intellectuals" must, I believe, begin with recognition of one fundamental fact — that we are dealing with the phenomenon that is known in biology as *symbiosis*. In other words, we are examining not one species, but two, that are interdependent.

As I have said, I consider this symbiosis as the fundamental fact in our problem tonight, so let me illustrate it with two or three examples that will make it clear.

In the second half of the 19th Century lived a distinguished French mathematician, Professor Michel Chasles. He was the author of a number of treatises that you will find cited in any reasonably complete work on geometrical theory, porisms, or conic sections. He developed a method of analytical geometry independent of the calculus, and his treatise on the displacement of solids is regarded as a mathematical classic. He was a member of the French Academie des Sciences, which means that he was recognized as one of the 66 best scientific minds in all France, and he was furthermore the recipient of the highest honor that the Royal Society of London could bestow.

Now Professor Chasles was quite wealthy, and one day there came to him an enterprising young intellectual named Vrain-Lucas, who was — he said — a specialist in finding old documents, particularly autographs. He sold the good professor an original letter which proved that Descartes had anticipated all the discoveries of Newton. Professor Chasles was elated to be the possessor of a document of such vast significance in the history of science, and his appetite was whetted for more. So he made Vrain-Lucas promise to bring to him all his sensational finds. Vrain-Lucas did; he supplied remarkable documents, first, one at a time, then by the dozen, and then by the score.

In a few years, M. Chasles had a much smaller balance at his bankers, but he owned a collection of treasures unmatched in the world, unique documents, almost all of them autographs, written by the great figures of history. He had original letters by

REVILOP. OLIVER

Can 'Liberals' be educated?

Pascal, by Montaigne, by Amerigo Vespucci, by Charlemagne, by St. Jerome, by Plato, by Socrates, and by many others. It would be hard to say which item in this collection of more than 600 letters was the most remarkable, but my favourite is the autographic love-letter written by Cleopatra to Julius Caesar — a letter that Cleopatra wrote with her own fair hand — with a steel pen — on rag paper — in 16th-Century French!

Now it may not be fair to single out the French mathematician from among the thousands of men like him, but just the same, if I had anything to do with running a college, I would see to it that a statue of Professor Chasles stood at the gates as a reminder of what education can do for a man.

If you ask which was the "intellectual", Professor Chasles or Vrain-Lucas, the answer, of course, is both of them. One, indeed, is to a large extent the cause of the other.

WELL-MEANING DUPES

Our race always has been, and probably always will be, afflicted with well-meaning people, usually well educated and sometimes brilliant, who simply cannot keep their imaginations under control. They are born to be the dupes of any scoundrel or adventurer who takes the trouble to put out a little bait for them, and they are often so generous that they do more than half his work for him and practically dupe themselves.

Many of you, I am sure, have read the *Memoirs Of Casanova*, who was an intellectual in his day and wrote a Utopia, the *Icosameron*, in which he shows how easy it would be for us to have One World chock full of "social justice". If you have read the *Memoirs*, you will recall the once celebrated Madame d'Urfe, who was not the object of one of Casanova's rather commonplace seductions, but instead the principal source of his income for a large part of his career.

Madame d'Urfe, whom Casanova met when she was fairly well along in years, was one of the wealthiest and most brilliant women in France. She was not only learned in the usual sense, but she was a chemist of some skill.

Now Casanova, who was skilled in cabalistic hocus-pocus, admits quite frankly that he set out to delude Mme. d'Urfe.

Mme. d'Urfe was tired of being a woman, and she insisted that Casanova make a man of her. She firmly believed that that was possible, because she had the same superstitious faith in the wonders of science.

that we see among our contemporaries, and, of course, she eventually killed herself with an overdose of drugs intended to hasten the wondrous transformation.

We may think her a fool for having believed that, but was it, after all, much more fantastic, much more contrary to the ascertained and obvious facts of nature, much more irrational than the tommyrot about noble savages, brotherhood, equality, world courts, and the like that some of her contemporaries — Rousseau, Helvetius, Saint-Pierre, and their kind — were busily peddling to persons as credulous as she?

LITTLE MEN WITH METAL HEADS

In 1943, a committee of the California Legislature stumbled on a weird organization called Mankind United, which supported an even more wonderful subsidiary called the Universal Institute for Research and Administration.

Now Mankind United had the usual noble purposes: it was working for the "brotherhood of man", "equal living conditions for all peoples", "equality of all races and creeds", "world government," and "world peace".

In other words, you see, Mankind United put out all the stale old sucker-bait that attracts do-gooders as infallibly as cheese brings a mouse to a trap. Mice never learn, of course, but then mice, so far as I know, never pose as "intellectuals" either.

Mankind United was remarkable in other ways. According to its official report, it had a membership of 176,000,000 men and women. But in addition to this large human membership, Mankind United, through the Universal Institute for Research, enlisted the cooperation of a race of little men with metal heads who live in the hollow center of the earth and produce earthquakes whenever they feel like shaking things up a bit on the surface.

The identifiable head of this great society was known to the Faithful as The Voice. He modestly claimed that he floated around the earth just by thinking himself wherever he wanted to be. When The Voice was located in a luxurious apartment in San Francisco, he gave the name of Arthur Lowber Bell, but added that he had so many names he couldn't be quite sure of that. On oath before the California Committee on Un-American Activities, he swore that he wasn't all there. His organization, you see, had so much business in so many parts of

the world that he just had to be in several places at the same time. Obviously, therefore, all of him couldn't be in any one place at one time. Logical, you see; you can't dispute that reasoning.

The California Committee was able to locate only a few thousand of Mankind United's 176,000,000 members. But there is the really significant thing. The membership included a very considerable number of college professors, teachers, physicians, lawyers, and other individuals who had been certified as literate by what are politely called institutions of higher learning. One of the most dedicated members was a full professor at the University of California, who had evidently resolved to devote his life to promoting "One World" through Mankind United — in cooperation, of course, with the great race of little men with metal heads downstairs.

Now I have not mentioned these examples, out of the many hundreds that could be cited, merely to amuse you. I intended them to illustrate the principle of symbiosis. The phenomenon that is called "liberal intellectualism" depends on the conjunction of two distinct species, the intellectual sucker and the intellectual shyster.

You noted, I am sure, that lucrative swindles, covering two centuries in time, used the same kind of sucker-bait to trap educated nincompoops. That immediately raises the question of how it is possible for such antiquated frauds to be peddled even in academic communities. The answer, of course, is the vast power that the "intellectuals" have attained and ruthlessly exert. Consider for a moment a typical example.

INTELLECTUAL BANKRUPTCY

Eight or nine years ago, an American scholar, Mathurin Dondo, wrote, on the basis of a great deal of research in French archives, a biography of Henri de Saint-Simon, who is generally regarded as the founder of modern Socialism.

Now Professor Dondo conscientiously and accurately reported the evidence, and he shows us what kind of man Saint-Simon was. He was, to put it briefly, a pathological liar who seems never to have told the truth about anything when he could possibly avoid it. He was an unprincipled opportunist who lived under every government in France from the *ancien regime* to the Restoration and, more agile in conscience than the Vicar of Bray; he proclaimed that each new government was the realization of his long-cherished ideals — and went on proclaiming it so long as he had a prospect of getting regular hand-outs from the treasury.

He was a debauche, given to abuse of alcohol, narcotics, and women, and while we may pardon men for almost any sensuality, our stomachs must turn at the hypocrite who makes his vices odious by claiming that his debauches are the result of a high-minded

urge to do sociological research.

Saint-Simon was from the first either a conscious fraud or subject to hallucinations, for he used to go into dark rooms and hold long conversations with Charlemagne, who, he said, was his ancestor. Saint-Simon had wonderful revelations in the dark room, reporting, among other things, that Charlemagne's ghost had joyfully recognized in Saint-Simon the greatest philosopher of the modern world.

Saint-Simon was also a resourceful man with a fine sense of social values: after he had talked a wealthy business man into endowing him with an annual pension, he went on to seduce or compromise that man's wife and so increase his income by levying secret blackmail on her.

All this — and more — Professor Dondo reports in his book. But at this point he comes up against the pet superstitions of our contemporary "intellectuals". For 150 years ago Saint-Simon, while extracting fast bucks from boobs — pardon me, while extracting fast francs from humanitarians — put out a lot of bunk that is still fashionable stock-in-trade. He denounced "colonialism" and said that it was the duty of prosperous nations to provide technical and financial assistance to "underdeveloped countries" so as to industrialize the whole world and make everyone as happy as larks.

He proved how awfully simple it was to abolish poverty everywhere by applying "science" to the twin problems of raising everyone's standard of living and organizing "social justice" everywhere to ensure world peace. He proved conclusively that by 1814 modern weapons had become so destructive that war was "unthinkable", and he was a vociferous apostle of a "United Nations" to replace war with "world cooperation". This stale old nonsense, of course, is still the stock-in-trade of the Liberal Establishment, which hasn't had a new idea, just as it hasn't learned anything, in 150 years. So what is a biographer of Saint-Simon to do? I quote verbatim from Professor Dondo's conclusion: "Saint-Simon profligate, impulsive, irrational, a plaything of his sensuous whims, victim of his delusions . . . belonged to the class of eccentric, unbalanced, unstable individuals from whom are recruited poets, reformers, founders of religion. The world's . . . salvation comes from the Saint-Simons."

There you have it, ladies and gentlemen. You have a serious scholar — who, I suspect, knows better — telling you by implication that ethical responsibility and simple honesty, reason and even the ability to distinguish between reality and hallucination, are merely the trammels of earthbound mortals, petty standards that must not be applied to anyone who has contracted — or says that he has contracted — a sanctifying itch to save the world. You have a responsible scholar telling you expressly that the world's salvation comes from whims, irrationality, and delusions.

You have also an open confession of the intellectual bankruptcy of so-called "liberalism". It is hard to take the peddlers

of such trumpery seriously, so long as one regards them as the merchants of ideas. "Intellectuals" such as Professor Chasles and Mme. d'Urfe, such as Vrain-Lucas and Casanova and even Saint-Simon, seem, on the whole, harmless, and we may even feel grateful to them for supplying us with many of the funniest true stories in the world. If it were merely a question of ideas, we could afford to sit back and laugh at the motley carnival of freaks and charlatans that has been touring our world for two centuries and relieving the yokels of their pocket money. If it were merely a question of ideas, such mountebanks could not have seriously disturbed the order and stability of the Western world.

CRIMINALS ENLIST DUPES

Obviously, we must look beyond ideas to discover what has made the self-styled "intellectuals" so formidable, and here again we find our clearest illustration in the 18th Century. On the first of May, 1776, an elaborate criminal conspiracy was organized by a diseased degenerate named Adam Weishaupt, who was Professor of Law — Canon Law, if you please — in the University of Ingolstadt. The conspiracy was a secret society whose members were known as the *Perfektibilisten*, although they are also called *Illuminati*.

The purpose of Weishaupt's conspiracy, as explicitly stated by himself in writing and accepted by his fellows in the inner circle of the organization, was, quite simply, conquest of the world by the destruction of civilization, including specifically in its program such items as the abolition of private property, the abolition of national governments, the abolition of all morality, and the abolition of Christianity and, indeed, of all religion.

Weishaupt's organization was divided into grades or degrees of initiation. The real purposes of the order were concealed completely from neophytes, and revealed only to those who had ascended through the preparatory degrees to the inner circle — and promotion from one degree to another was, of course, available only to those who evinced a capacity for progressing at least a stage or two toward the insane nihilism of the inner circle. The rest were kept, of course, in lower grades proportionate to their capacities. As Weishaupt wrote to his colleagues, urging more intensive recruiting of neophytes:

"These good people swell our numbers and fill our money-box; set yourselves to work; these gentlemen must be made to nibble at the bait . . . But this sort of people must always be made to believe that the grade they have reached is the last."

Thus it was that a conspiracy for the destruction of all European nations was able to enlist among its members some of the reigning princes of Germany, and a conspiracy for the abolition of Christianity was able to enlist pious Christians. The latter Weishaupt regarded as the best joke of all. He wrote:

Contd. on page 10

BRITISH DEFENCE

TIME FOR NEW THINKING

(PART 3)

IN the first two parts of this article I have concentrated on the question of why Britain's defence policies should be *nationally* orientated, instead of aiming at the integration of our defences with those of other nations of the non-communist world. My purpose has been to state why Britain must become a strong military power in her own right, with adequate forces to defend her vital interests unaided if necessary, under her own complete command and equipped by weapons of British manufacture.

Much of the argument against this policy hinges, not upon its desirability in principle, but upon its feasibility given our present economic power and resources. We must tailor our defences, it is claimed, to the national economic situation and the money we can afford to allocate to defence spending along with other demands on the national purse.

In any age less confused than our own, this would immediately be seen as a quite fantastic supposition — at least by all serious minded Britons. It is as if our national defences — our means of national survival — were to be placed on no higher level of importance than fancy showpieces, erected to titillate the public, rather than a first priority of existence.

To look at the matter in another way, what would we think if insurance companies, instead of assessing their premiums on holders' policies on the basis of the value of the property to be insured and the risk attending it, started to make such assessments on the basis of the policy holder's income and what he could afford to pay to insure his property after other wants, such as booze, cigarettes and amusements, had been paid for?

One thing is certain: there would be no insurance business for very long and therefore no property would be safe.

Yet this is the type of logic on which contemporary defence-cutters try to justify their policies. It is lunacy of the first order, nothing less.

The needs for the defence of the realm of Britain depend on a number of factors; some of them are strategic factors which change little, if at all, with the passing of time; they are the result of our geographical position *viz-a-viz* other powers; others arise out of the contemporary world situation and the consequent likelihood of hostile intent on the part of any of these other powers towards Britain. Here there can be changes as time progresses, changes for the better or for the worse.

But in no way have changes in the economic condition of the country the slightest relevance to the needs of defence. They only determine what other things in life we can afford once defence has been paid for. Defence itself is always the absolute priority and must be maintained before any other expenditure can be considered.

None of this should be taken to mean that a defence policy need take no account of economics whatsoever. It is one thing to say that national defence requirements should be met as a priority over all other demands of public expenditure; it is another thing entirely to say that defence capacity is completely unrelated to economic capability. Our party criticises Britain's present weakness in defence because we believe that, notwithstanding our current economic ill health, we can and must afford to pay much more for defence by foregoing other, inessential, things — comforts that make life easier but are not vital to life itself. But not for one moment do we suggest that an economically stronger Britain would not be much

better placed in the matter of maintaining strong armed forces. The more that a nation's defence comes to rely on the aptitude of its industry and technology — as indeed it increasingly does in the modern world — the more economic health becomes a factor in the balance of military power.


However, it is the task of a political movement such as ours, when making projections as to the development of national military strength, to base those projections not principally on current economic conditions but on the economic conditions that are possible when the full economic potential of the nation is being realised under new leadership and through new policies. It might be otherwise were we purely a non-political pressure group concerned to influence only defence policy, but as we are a fully comprehensive political movement our policies on defence must be seen within the context of a wider programme for national recovery, embracing political and economic changes — and not only these but changes in the national moral and psychological climate as well. All these factors influence military capability, and the last perhaps most of all since it concerns the very basic matter of the *will* of a nation to defend itself. To this subject we will return later.

Coming back now to the feasibility argument employed by our contemporary anti-defence lobby, we may see that in this argument there are two fashionable strands: in one there is the emphasis on economic limitations, which I have examined; in the other strand there is the emphasis on limitations of size. A brief examination of this line of argument will expose it as being equally fallacious.

Britain, so the argument goes, cannot look after her own defence because she is not big enough. In order to support this argument the size of Britain is conveniently compared with that of the three very largest powers in the world, rather than with the size and development of the nations of the world on average. By the latter standard Britain is in fact a bigger nation than most, and of the few which do match her in size fewer still do so in the scale of their economic and technical development — even allowing for current weaknesses, which are remediable — or indeed in the full range of resources which she could reasonably expect to call upon in wartime.

And even where comparison with the very biggest states is a relevant one, there is no reason to presume automatically that Britain's military potential stands in the same relationship to theirs as might be suggested by a comparison of pure population statistics. Taking Russia as one case, the size of that country is nothing new; its population relative to that of Britain is little different to what it was a hundred years ago, yet no-one at that time thought for a moment of describing Britain as a lesser power. She was in fact a power of at least equal, and probably superior, rank to Russia by virtue of her more homogeneous population and that population's greater average intelligence and all round aptitude; her more sophisticated industry and technology; and a political leadership of at least equal strength of will and preparedness to assert itself in the cause of national interests wherever in the world they may be at stake — these things and a people infused for the most part with an extremely virile patriotism and self-confidence.

Not even Britain's vast imperial possessions of a hundred years ago can be cited as an argument against this thesis. The British Empire of that time may indeed have been vast on paper but, as



**SOVIET
WARSHIP
Patrolling
our seas
while
Britain's
defence
budget
is cut.**

Correlli Barnett points out with ample supporting facts in *The Collapse of British Power*, the Empire contributed at that time very little to Britain's armed weight in terms of manpower and none at all in terms of weapons production. By rights it should have been organised to do so but in point of fact it was not. Nevertheless, Britain, drawing on the industrial resources of the United Kingdom alone, found no difficulty in maintaining a fleet which dominated the seas even more thoroughly in Victorian times than Russia's does now.

What is it then that today makes Britain's power to wage war so puny in relation to that of Russia? Three things; our own industrial disorganisation, which needs be no more than temporary; our weak-kneed political leadership, which clearly lacks the assertive will of its predecessors; lastly, as mentioned in the first part of this article, the artificial level of the Soviet military build-up made possible only by massive economic and technical aid from Russia's friends in the West.

As with Russia, America's lack of racial homogeneity must detract more than somewhat from the strength that is suggested by a mere *prima facie* glance at her population and production statistics. Of her 210 million people, it has been reliably estimated that about a third consists of races that are permanently unassimilable apart from being of a generally lower order of intelligence and aptitude.

The ability of America's industry and technology to sustain a vast war armoury is not in doubt; much more seriously in doubt is her ability to provide all the additional human ingredients of a fighting force of super-power standards — at least on the scale reckoned by orthodox strategists today.

Equally relevant as a consideration of America's war potential is the factor of a political system which places the leadership in the constant position of being a yo-yo between the demands of diverse and often conflicting ethnic groups and their interests. The will of such a leadership to wage resolute war on a major scale must surely be in question.

It is then just as wrong to be dazzled by considerations of mere size when estimating military potential today as it was a hundred years ago, or a hundred years previously. It must not be forgotten that France was 2 to 3 times a larger state than Britain at the time of Waterloo, as was Spain larger than England when the Armada sailed. These facts did not lead our rulers to deduce that independent British defences were not possible.

In this analysis of size and economic resources in determining defence policy it has been assumed that Britain can only rely with certainty on what forces can be raised within the United Kingdom

alone, and that no British Commonwealth contribution to the fighting of a major war can be counted on in the future in view of the current trend towards weaker Commonwealth ties. This is the safe basis on which to plan defence policy considering Britain's present situation.

Nevertheless, it should not be taken for granted that in any such war contingency the Commonwealth would not, as it in the past, be fighting as one. Whatever the present state of Commonwealth relationships, the Commonwealth countries — plus Rhodesia and South Africa — do have common interests with Britain and every incentive to stand together against common aggressors.

It has always been the policy of the National Front to work for a re-strengthening of Commonwealth ties, and certainly a United Kingdom pulling its full economic and military weight in the world would be in the best possible position to bring this about.

In contrast to a hundred years ago, the combined White population and industrial resources of the British Commonwealth countries is considerable. If these were allied to Britain in war, the result would be a power with very few rivals anywhere.

It must be remembered that the Commonwealth countries did not turn away from Britain and towards America for their defensive alliances by choice; they were forced to do so by the obviously apparent abandonment by Britain in the post-war period of its will to defend either itself or its friends and kinfolk; were there to be a sign that this will were re-activated, there is every possibility that a Commonwealth defensive system could be revived.

But even if this factor cannot be counted on — at least in the short term, Britain alone can certainly, under firm government and with revitalised industry exploiting all native skills to maximum effect, mobilise defences adequate to deter any aggressor.

Few people who soak up the daily diet of defeatism fed to them by the mass media, which constantly belittle Britain in every way, realise that this defeatism is deliberately inspired and spread by the enemies of this country within, with the object of having our national weaknesses magnified and our strengths played down, so that a feeling of national impotence may lower resistance to those dedicated to undermining Britain's freedom.

It is the task of our movement to educate the public to an understanding of the true military potential of our country — which in size is second to very few and in quality second to none.

Much has to be done, however, for that potential to be realised. What must be done economically belongs to an entirely separate subject; what must be done politically will be discussed in the next part of this article.

Dedicated to the Gatwick Affair

Come to good old England if you're black and stoney broke,
Five star accommodation and public purse to soak.

Come to good old England, Gatwick's the place to seek,
No work, no tax, no worry and sixty quid a week.

Come to good old England, we're free and easy here.
Our new found Race Relations leaves nothing you can fear.

Come to good old England for a life to be enjoyed,
Unaccustomed luxury to swell the unemployed.

Come to good old England to jump the housing queue,
Over a million waiting but not of course for you.

Come to good old England, our doors are opened wide.
Bring all your wives and uncles, the law is on your side.

Come to good old England, for here you've got it made,
For health and handsome handouts especially National Aid.

Come to good old England, it's like winning on the Pools,
Yes, come, do come to England, we're a land of bloody fools!

CAN 'LIBERALS' BE EDUCATED?

Contd. from page 7

"The most wonderful thing of all is that the distinguished Lutheran and Calvinist theologians who belong to our Order really believe that they see in it the true and genuine mind of the Christian religion. Is there anything that you cannot make men believe?"

Weishaupt's Illuminati provide us with a perfect working model of conspiratorial activity among "intellectuals", show how easy it is for adroit criminals to enlist and manipulate educated suckers, and, above all, bring us face to face with the highly distasteful fact that mankind does produce criminals like Weishaupt and his confederates in the inner circle.

CAN LIBERALS LEARN THE OBVIOUS?

But what about the "intellectual" suckers, the literate and well-meaning dopes like Professor Chasles and Mme. d'Urfe and the rest? Can they be educated? Or, if that cannot be done, are they at least intelligent enough to learn from experience when the see that they have been hoaxed?

Some, no doubt. There have been several recent books, by John Dos Passos and Edmund Wilson, for example, by honest "liberal intellectuals" who give most encouraging indications that they are beginning to grow up, now that they are past 60 or 70. But the proportion, I am afraid, is small. I do wish that one of these busy-bodies who are forever making "statistical studies" about nonsense would make a statistical study that would mean something — a statistical study of the capacity of "intellectuals" to learn the obvious.

There is abundant material for dozens of studies of that kind. Here is just one example:

As we all know now, the International Communist Conspiracy, coordinating the efforts of its divisional headquarters in New York, Washington, and Moscow, used your money to install in Cuba, in January 1959, a notorious Communist agent named Fidel Castro, and started to work immediately to install military and naval bases, including submarine pens and ballistic missiles, 90 miles from our shores. Of course, the Conspiracy through its various outlets, such as the *New York Times* and other lie-papers, poured out hogwash about "agrarian reformers" and "the George Washington of Cuba". And it was only to be expected that our "intellectuals" who had swallowed exactly the same swill a few years before when the United States delivered China to the Communist Conspiracy, lapped it up again with relish.

During the summer and autumn of 1961 the Communist subsidiary called "Fair Play for Cuba", which, of course, had been thoroughly exposed as a Communist front by that time, sent up smoke-screens for Comrade Fidel on a national scale, using, of

course, a great many "liberal intellectuals" in the faculties of our colleges and universities. Those persons went on record publicly as endorsing Castro, guaranteeing that he was a sweet and lovely "democrat" and "social reformer", and even demanding in some cases that he be given a pipe-line direct to the Treasury in Washington. As I say, these people went on record publicly, signing manifestoes and inserting full-page advertisements in newspapers. In some universities, as many as 300 individuals connected with the faculty or administration went on record in that way. The total throughout the country must be several thousand.

It is only charitable to suppose that the majority of the signers of those manifestoes were just intellectual suckers who actually believed the tripe to which they affixed their names.

Now, as you may remember, in December 1961, sweet Fidel made monkeys out of those supermen by going on the radio and boasting that he had been a Bolshevik ever since he was a boy.

"INTELLECTUALS" EXPOSED

At that point, the intellectual suckers must have realized that they had been had. The whole list of signers stood exposed before the American public.

When a normally intelligent human being has been swindled, he sits down and reviews very carefully the sources of information on which he relied, the weaknesses in himself, and the tricks of the confidence men who took him in, and he tries to make sure that he will not be caught again in the same way. That's what ordinarily intelligent and prudent people do and I should think that that is not too much to expect of "intellectuals".

But it is a curious and perhaps significant fact that, so far as I have been able to learn, not one peep was heard from all those thousands of super-brains the day after Castro made his announcement — or the week after — or the month after — or the year after — or down to the present time.

Now it's possible, of course, that the poor suckers were so embarrassed that they kept quiet in the hope that their friends and neighbours would charitably forget their humiliation and disgrace.

So that is why I should like to see some investigator make the sociological study that I have suggested. All he would have to do is compile the names, which, as I have said, are all on record in print, and then ascertain how many of the signers are still out Communist-fronting and whooping it up for current and unmistakable Communist operations, such as "disarmament" or the race war now being waged against white Americans.

Until such a statistical investigation has been made, it would be a little venture some to guess what percentage of "liberal intellectuals" are intelligent enough to learn

from their own experience.

Now I certainly do not want to seem discouraging, ladies and gentlemen, but my best guess, for what it may be worth, is that among the honest "intellectuals", the percentage of recovery is comparatively small. They may mean well, but, like confirmed alcoholics, they have acquired the habit of escape from reality into the Wonderland Behind the Looking Glass.

If candid, they would have to say of themselves what one of their idols, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, admitted to Boswell in an unguarded moment: "I cannot tolerate the world as it is; I must live in a world of fantasies".

Such habits, once acquired, are extremely hard to break. That is why I fear that many "liberal intellectuals", like so many alcoholics, just can't get along without their hooch!

1976 NATIONAL FRONT A.G.M.

All NF members please take note that the NF A.G.M. will take place on Saturday 16th October

at
Conway Hall, Red Lion Square,
London, W.C.1.

The meeting will commence at 9.45 a.m. and conclude at 6.00 p.m.

Only members whose subscriptions are paid up for 1976 may attend this most important meeting. Pay your subscription now.

Branch Group and Regional organisers should provide coach transportation for members to and from the meeting.

Full details concerning submission of resolutions and amendments to resolutions for debate at the A.G.M., proxy voting facilities, etc., are contained in the July/August issue of the *NF Members' Bulletin*. Any NF member who has not received a copy by 1st August should write or 'phone NF Head Office.

NF NATIONAL DIRECTORATE ELECTIONS

Will all NF members take note that elections for the 13 places on the NF National Directorate which will fall vacant on Saturday 9th October, 1976, will take place during September.

Full details concerning arrangements for the elections are contained in the July/August issue of the *NF Members' Bulletin*. Nomination forms will also be issued with the bulletin. Any members who have not received a copy by 1st August should contact NF Head Office immediately.

The final date for receipt of nomination forms is Saturday 28th August.

Those seeking nominations must be Full Members of the NF whose membership subscriptions are paid up for 1976, and who have an unbroken record of 2 years' Full Membership. Additionally, they must have served a total of two years as an elected officer of the party, and be an elected officer of the party at the time of nomination.

Ballot papers will be posted to all members on or about 3rd September. Members who have not received ballot papers by 8th September should 'phone Head Office immediately. The final date for receipt of marked ballot papers will be Monday 13th September.

SHOULD THE N.F. INVOLVE ITSELF IN E.E.C. ELECTIONS?

UNLESS the European Economic Community breaks up — which is possible but not, I regret, probable — it seems fairly certain that the role of the so-called European Parliament will be enhanced by means of the establishment of a system whereby its members are directly elected by constituents. This development will give the illusion of democracy and legitimacy to E.E.C. tyranny.

Naturally, we of the National Front are utterly opposed to this development, the purpose of which is to reduce in power and stature our British Parliament and to assist in the development of the treasonable "European nation".

There can only be one sovereign Parliament. What the Euro-traitors are planning is the seepage of sovereignty from Westminster to the Euro-Parliament. If the ultimate sovereignty is held by the Euro-Parliament, then Britain will no longer be a free nation, but a sort of county or province of Europe.

Having made it clear that the NF is totally, unequivocally and for all time opposed to the development of the Euro-Parliament, and is totally committed to withdrawing Britain from the Common Market and all its institutions, we have to face the fact that until the British people give us the mandate to put into effect our ultimate intention, we face the problem of deciding how we will react, as a political party, to the new political situation which the Euro-traitors are constructing.

In short, should we involve ourselves in the elections which will take place for the Euro-Parliament or not?

"DON'T VOTE" CAMPAIGN?

I have posed this question to a number of NF members, and I regret that many of them say to me that so far they just haven't given the problem an awful lot of thought. Others have for reasons of instinctive hostility to all Euro-institutions replied:

"No! We should have no involvement in any E.E.C. election. If we did so, it would be taken to be an indication that we recognised the validity of a Euro-Parliament! Our job must be to persuade people not to vote in any such elections! We should ignore the Euro-Parliament!"

While agreeing entirely with the spirit of hostility to the Euro-Parliament which these people express, I have to say that I disagree with their strategical approach.

Firstly, I do not think that the NF has, or is likely to have within a decade or so, a powerful enough alternative media to be able to persuade enough British voters not to vote in European elections.

As we saw with the Common Market referendum last year, our anti-E.E.C. voice is puny compared with the orchestrated bawling of the whole Establishment media. In the referendum two-thirds of the population were persuaded to vote, and two-thirds of those who voted were either conned or frightened into voting "Yes".

I think the media will use fear to drive the voters to the polls in Euro-elections — at least in sufficient enough numbers to make the elections and the institution which they serve credible.

The fear message will be: "You may not like the Euro-Parliament — but it will have power to affect your way of life. If Britons don't send a

strong representation to the Euro-Parliament, you can be sure all those nasty foreigners will do so! If Britain suffers as a result, you will only have yourselves to blame!"

The media will in fact promote a perverse form of 'nationalism' to stampede voters to the polls!

ELECTIONS BUILD THE IMAGE

My second main reason for thinking we should nominate candidates in elections to the Euro-Parliament is that I think that the NF should always be where the action is. The reason why the NF has grown, not just in terms of numbers of members, but in reputation in the public mind as a *bona fide* political party, is because we have made great efforts to stand in elections — ANY elections.

Elections are what makes a political party live. We have congratulated ourselves on the great showing which NF candidates have made in the recent local government elections. We were delighted when Leicester Branch made an incredible effort to put up a full complement of three candidates in every single one of the 16 wards in the City.

Just suppose each of those candidates had won . . . we could not have repatriated a single Immigrant thereby; we could not have set in motion the withdrawal of Britain from the E.E.C.; we could not have set in motion the rebuilding of our defence forces, nor could we have done so many of the other things which are the major issues which cause people to vote for the NF even in local Council elections.

What we would have achieved would be a massive moral and political blow against the Establishment which would contribute towards the build-up of a chain reaction of defeats for the Establishment at our hands.

To a lesser extent we achieved just that kind of outcome as a result of our effort in Leicester this year even though we did not get one candidate elected.

What we did demonstrate by putting up all those candidates, was the following:—

1. We are organisationally strong, and getting stronger.
2. It is no longer a "tiny minority" of people who support us, but more than 25 per cent of the White electorate of a major city.
3. Because of the huge total of our vote, and because we came within a hair's breadth of winning, we have shown that a vote for the NF is not "a wasted vote".
4. We totally eclipsed the Liberal Party both in terms of numbers of candidates, in terms of average votes per candidate, and in terms of the total poll.
5. All the above-mentioned propaganda effects will incline even more people to vote NF in next year's County Council elections, in which the NF will have even more candidates standing as a result of this year's effort in the City Council elections.
6. The fabulous vote for the NF in Leicester won national press and TV publicity . . . as did the fine votes achieved by NF candidates in Bradford, Sandwell (West Midlands) and many other places. This national press publicity showing the NF doing well in elections (no matter what the elections) raises the status of the NF in the minds of the voting public nationwide.

The same kind of benefits have come to us as a result of our making every effort to fight every Parliamentary by-election. We know that one candidate could not achieve all that we ultimately desire. We do not even consider that at this particular time an NF candidate in a by-election stands a very good chance of winning . . . save in a select number of constituencies.

But we fight all such elections we can to give people an opportunity to vote NF, to give the press an opportunity to write about the NF, and to give us the opportunity to demonstrate to the electorate nationwide that we have a growing and substantial following everywhere.

ELECTIONS WIN RECRUITS

A final reason why we benefit from fighting in all elections, no matter what elections they be, is so that we can use the medium of the electoral system to pump out vast quantities of literature into millions of homes whose occupants might not otherwise know that we even existed, let alone what we stood for.

Quite regardless of the numbers of votes we might pull from such massive leafletting operations, fighting elections wins new recruits and builds new Branches of the party, so that even more electoral activity can be indulged in.

Because of our increased election work, more and more British people expect as a matter of course to see the name of the NF on every ballot paper in every type of election. The majority of the electorate are not politically sophisticated, and are not (yet) as militantly hostile to the E.E.C. as the average NF member is.

Thus our growing band of supporters will feel that there is something wrong, that they have been cheated, or that we have let them down, if we do not appear on the ballot papers of the coming Euro-elections.

Why should we deny ourselves the practical benefits of standing in such elections simply on account of our pique that a Euro-Parliament even exists? If we do not stand in Euro-elections our reasons, no matter how ideologically pure, will just not be understood by the masses who support us and who want to vote for us.

We can with good conscience stand in the Euro-elections and tell the voters: "We want to destroy the whole E.E.C. set-up . . . but that will take time, and in the meanwhile unless you vote NF, only pro-E.E.C. politicians will be represented in its institutions. They will put Europe first and Britain second. Elect us, and you can be sure that we will fight to put Britain first! We will be able to expose any betrayals of British interests in a way that the pro-E.E.C. politicians would not do."

I believe that NF candidates selling themselves as an anti-E.E.C. "night watchman" in Euro-elections would be an extremely attractive option for the millions of voters who are still suspicious of or hostile to the E.E.C., and who still wish to record an anti-Common Market vote.

If, as it is predicted, Euro-elections will be on some form of proportional representation system, then on the basis of our present showing in elections, we stand a fine chance of getting candidates elected . . . but even if we didn't, we would still reap the benefits of being where the action is and where our growth always comes from: The Hustings!

Touching a nerve on Fleet Street

JAMES CAMERON, the spidery, dehydrated old Leftist left over from the Spanish Civil War, had a nasty turn recently — a sort of billious attack that frothed onto the pages of the *Guardian*.

The reason why Cameron did not feel at all well was that the National Front had just polled 6 per cent of the vote in the Rotherham parliamentary by-election, after starting from scratch with only two members in the constituency prior to polling day.

The spectre of tramping jackboots and the Condor Legion doubtless rose before him in the bar of *El Vino's* and off he went scribbling the most nauseating multi-racialist drivel as you are ever likely to read from one of the principal mouthpieces of contemporary liberalism.

But Cameron's effusions repay study, because they provide a perfect insight into the liberal syndrome, and into a system already aware that its days are numbered.

Everyone would agree with William Buckley that liberalism is a mania, in the strict sense of the word, for whenever its pet ideological assumptions are challenged or threatened, it sets off in liberals all sorts of impulsive, emotional and irrational responses, most of which reveal liberals to be not very 'liberal' at all.

And so it is with Cameron. He is a person who under any other circumstances would proclaim the virtues of free speech and expression, open dialogue, hearing the other man's point of view and all the rest of it. Indeed, if ever one of his beloved Third Worlders mugged him in his front garden, raped his wife and burned his house down, he would probably say, "He has a point of view and I think we should hear it".

Remember, though, that liberals suffer from a mania. The spectacle of the rising force and vote-winning potential of the National Front sets off such an emotional reaction in Cameron that all the waffle about freedom of expression instinctively evaporates. The mask drops and the real nature of 'liberalism' is revealed. Commenting on Mr Jenkins refusal to ban National Front activities on the grounds that he wished to preserve freedom of speech and civil liberties, Cameron hissed, "That seems to me to be a particularly supine equivocation". What he really means, of course, (he has to express it fancifully because although he goes much further than Jenkins he lacks the courage to say so openly) is: "That's weak and evasive — the National Front should be banned!"

So much for all those liberal values

that he once defended under the broiling Spanish sun from the menace of fascism. Cameron wants to ban the activities of a political party. And if he wants to, you can certainly bet that all the other liberals would like to ban the NF too if they thought they could get away with it and, above all, if they had the strength of their convictions.

EFFETE AND EXHAUSTED

But that is the ironic thing — they don't. And that is why it is going to be the easiest thing in the world to sweep liberal ideology off the map. Liberalism, unlike communism, is the ideology of an effete and exhausted civilisation that does not have the will to defend itself. The Communist party has already declared that it will ban the National Front if it were ever in a position to do so, and they would certainly have no compunction about it. Communists do not make any pretence at being either liberal or democratic in such matters. One is reminded of an exchange between Hermann Goering and German Communist leader Ernst Thalmann, who was protesting at his incarceration in a concentration camp:

"You know perfectly well, my dear Thalmann, that if our positions were reversed you would have me shot."

"Certainly," replied the Communist.

"Then you are hardly in a position to complain," beamed the rotund Nazi, and Thalmann had to concede the point. Bearing in mind these logical implications, the communist leaders of the National Union of Mineworkers, who recently demanded a ban on the National Front, ought to consider themselves very fortunate that they face the democratic NF instead of a few real Fascists who would certainly repay in kind.

What Cameron's outburst on banning the activities of the National Front signifies is that liberalism is not only a collection of totally incredible and absurd ideas such as that all races are equal, but that it is an obsession, which induces reactions in liberals which they themselves are not supposed to approve of.

People like Cameron pretend that liberalism stands for a sort of perpetual hearing of all ideas. But as soon as National Front ideas receive substantial support at Rotherham, the disciples of toleration start getting the knives out. This, of course, comes as no real surprise, for every viewer of the BBC will have noticed that, where liberals are concerned, free exchange of ideas is something one has with Communists or atheists

or perverts, but not with the National Front. Ours is a viewpoint that somehow never gets a look in amongst all the "open-ended dialogue".

The usual excuse for this glaring disparity between liberal dogma and practise is that the racial/nationalist viewpoint is not an intellectually valid one (which is really amusing coming from flat-earth multi-racialists who believe in fairy-stories like "human equality"), that it is just a lot of emotional 'prejudice' and is self-evidently evil. Hence Cameron went on to justify his illiberal outburst by saying that the NF were "half-baked Hitlers", a "perilous virus" and a "sour infection" which had contested Rotherham "on a basis of malice and jealousy". (Note the language from an apostle of tolerance and moderation). Needless to say, there is no record of Cameron ever saying that Tribunites are half-baked Stalins who contest their seats on the basis of malicious class envy and jealousy. Such an outburst is reserved only for those who touch the nerve of the liberal mania.

"Perhaps because I have spent so much of my life as a one-man minority, a conspicuous White among all those Asians, Africans and Caribbeans, that I have a special horror of this racial nonsense . . . They have put up with me in their lands; I can live with them in mine."

Guardian readers must have held their breaths at the stunning logic of that statement: merely because James Cameron has spent a large portion of his life happily abasing himself throughout the Third World, it therefore follows that the occupation of Britain by millions of coloured aliens cannot be a bad thing. To say otherwise is "racial nonsense".

TOTALLY IRRATIONAL

I submit this statement as proof positive that liberalism is not a coherent intellectual viewpoint but a totally irrational and emotional state of mind.

The thing which threw the mental co-ordinates of this boring old Leftist into total disarray was that the National Front believes "that the famous British working-class tolerance and decency is a myth waiting to be undermined, and they could be right, given time".

Of course, it is a myth, yet another of those fallacious absurdities that middle class leftists in particular are addicted to for purely emotional reasons. No class of society is born with genetic dollops of "tolerance", least of all a robust and vigorous working class which has a surer instinct for self-preservation. Sooner rather than later they are going to flock to the National Front in their hundreds of thousands when they see that there is a real alternative to alien occupation.

By that time James Cameron, if he has not fled to Asia, will be writing the obituary of liberalism.



1776-1976: Britain's 200- year hang-up

BACK IN APRIL our journal contained a comment on the rather extraordinary phenomenon of Britons celebrating what was, for our country, a defeat and a disaster: the loss of the American colonies and the setting up of the United States. In view of many goings on last month, some further reflection on this phenomenon seems called for.

With the coming of July 4th last it might have seemed that the whole of Britain had been struck by some peculiar delirium, so grossly overplayed was our recognition of this, the national day of what is, after all is said and done, a foreign country which in recent times has not performed us any particularly valuable service.

While newspaper editorials positively oozed homage to the United States, radio and television services went completely overboard in their rush to feature American programmes. BBC 1 devoted five hours viewing to programmes marking the U.S. Bi-centenary. BBC 2 was only a little way behind with 4½ hours, while ITV gave about 3 hours. On Radio 3 the entire evening, 5.0 to 11.25, was given up to 8 programmes broadcast under the umbrella heading 'Tribute to the U.S.A.'.

One American interviewed on a morning radio programme went so far as to say that Britain seemed to be making an even bigger fuss about the Bi-centenary than his own country.

Speaking personally, I find something utterly undignified, indeed almost sickly, in our national behaviour on this issue. But then the British Establishment always has had a tendency to go all silly about America. For decades it kidded itself that a 'special relationship' existed between that country and ours which rendered inconceivable any conflict of interest or aspiration, but in fact for a long time this relationship has been pure mirage - concealing very real divergences which Americans have always been more ready to face than we have. As Correlli Barnett put it in *The Collapse of British Power*. -

"The British indeed displayed towards the United States the forgiveness, the blind-

ness towards blemishes of character and conduct, commonly found in a man infatuated. For the British governing classes were infatuated with America - or, rather, with a mythical America conjured up by their own romantic vision . . .

" . . . For necessarily underlying British belief in the myth was an assumption that the Americans too believed in it; that they for their part saw the British as less 'foreign' than other nations, to be judged according to special standards of charity and understanding; that they too felt there to be a natural harmony between British and American interests and policies. The assumption was mistaken . . . The special 'relationship' was a British fantasy. It was love in the perfect romantic style, unrequited and unencouraged, yet nevertheless pursued with a grovelling ardour . . ."

The same grovelling ardour could be seen in the July 4th *Sunday Express* leader, which cried:-

"On this her birthday, as over the past 200 years, America remains the hope of the world . . . Her prodigious armoury is the shield of all nations who love freedom . . ."

No worse claptrap could have been emitted by a British newspaper. The fact is that America's armoury, whether prodigious or not, has proved completely worthless in the matter of defending the freedom of one nation after another menaced by Communism. It proved worthless in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia; it failed to come to the rescue of Hungary or Czechoslovakia; it stood idle when the Soviets established a bridgehead in Cuba; it has done nothing whatever to stop the red take-over of Mozambique and Angola.

Not only has American 'might' proved a paper tiger before the worldwide red onslaught, but that very red onslaught itself has been made possible only by the willing export to the Soviets of American technology and American financial aid.

While the Western world has crooned for the last 30 years about America being the bastion of 'freedom', it has in fact been the cosmopolitan financial establishment, using America as its base, which has sub-

sidised the enemies of freedom everywhere and is responsible today for the peril in which freedom stands.

And so far as Britain is concerned, it may be said that there is scarcely a single phase in our surrender of empire, of world power, wealth and influence in the 20th Century that has not taken place partly or wholly through American pressure.

It should therefore thoroughly revolt Britons in whom there reside vestiges of national self-respect that we should today be making a spectacle of ourselves by celebrating the birth of the United States as if it were some kind of victory for us, and as if what followed from it was a series of events which enriched and strengthened our own country.

Notwithstanding all this, there is much to admire in America and, like it or not, we have to live with her in the world today. While the American establishment is no friend of ours, the American people should certainly be no enemy. I as much as any Briton want good relations with the United States, even though I do not fall victim to the deception that there is a practical basis for good relations today.

But I want Britain to speak to America, not as a fawning supplicant, but as a proud and self-reliant great power, begging nothing and presuming nothing. When we do that - and we have not done it for a long time - America and the world will respect us, and we may even achieve some worthwhile 'relationship' at long last.

READ

National Front News

A broadsheet published monthly in support of the National Front. Subscriptions only for 5 copies or more. 12 issues of 5 copies, £4.08.

Reduced rates for bulk supplies given on request. Send 11½p for sample copy now.

INTEGRATION: LESSONS FROM THE PAST

ONE OF THE favourite tales that the integrationists use to justify the present massive influx of immigrants into this country goes something like this: "Just who are the British? Britain has been colonised by successive waves of immigrants and the present influx is no different from the previous ones except for the colour of their skin. All previous immigrant groups have been successfully integrated as the present immigrants will be".

They even go into some detail to show who these different immigrants groups are. Britain was first colonised by pagan tribes from the continent. In 55 B.C. the Romans invaded and conquered these people. When the Romans left, early in the fifth century, there were several more waves of immigrants from the continent — mainly Angles, Saxons, Jutes and marauding Vikings. In 1066 the Normans conquered and colonised Britain. Although Britain hasn't been invaded since then, there have been many more new immigrant arrivals. In the seventeenth century the Huguenots fled from the continent to Britain. For some reason Jewish people were unpopular in Russia in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, and they were again unpopular in Germany in the 1930's, so thousands of them fled to this country. More refugees, mainly eastern European, settled here after the last war and then, during the 1950's came the present immigrants from the Commonwealth. In addition to these the Irish have been arriving in this country for centuries.

The initial reaction to this piece of integrationist propaganda is that, even if racial factors were not involved, most of these "immigrants" came here when Britain was underpopulated and could absorb them. We are now an overcrowded island with one of the highest population densities in the world and we have no room for further immigration, whether it is likely to benefit us or otherwise.

Above all, however, **all previous immigrants were of European origin.** The present immigrants — who are from Africa, Asia and the West Indies — will never successfully integrate with people of European origin — except at the expense of our ruin.

It is surely of significance that all immigrant groups have had to fight for acceptance from the indigenous inhabitants. It took years of warfare until the Romans finally conquered Britain, and even then

there were some parts of Britain that they could not subdue; Hadrian's wall was not originally constructed as a tourist attraction. The semi legendary King Arthur was a British chief who led his people in many battles against the Saxon invaders of this country in the sixth century. Although the Normans defeated the English in the battle of Hastings, their rule was not finally accepted for centuries. Many of the ruined castles scattered around the country today were built by them to keep their rebellious subjects in order.

Integrationists like to give the impression that if it wasn't for Enoch Powell and the National Front we would have virtually complete integration now, but historical experience **even of peoples of the same race** proves otherwise. Friction and violence between the indigenous inhabitants of this country and new arrivals is both normal and natural, and all the propaganda and coercion of the Race Relations industry will not prevent it. Even today it is not unusual for over-enthusiastic Welsh rugby supporters to refer to the English as "Saxon pigs". Several convicted I.R.A. bombers are said to have been born and lived all their lives in this country, but they still regard themselves as Irishmen first. Every time there is a confrontation between the Arabs and the Israelis many British Jews give money and other forms of assistance to the Israelis, despite the fact that they have been living in Britain longer than Israel has existed.

This consciousness of race is something that will inevitably be more profoundly felt when the immigrants themselves are truly alien races from the primitive backwaters of Africa and Asia. It would take centuries (not decades, as the integrationists naively proclaim) to achieve "integration", and that would happen only when the ethnic lines were slowly blurred — which is the major genetic threat posed by immigration.

Many immigrant invasions have left Britain a radically altered country. Britain was very different after the Romans left from what it was before their invasion. It was different again after the Saxons and the Normans came. It is certain that the Jews — a comparatively recent immigrant group and one which only makes up less than 1% of the population — exert a considerable influence on our present way of life through their prominence in the House of Commons, in business, the media and the entertainment

industry. Such a tiny minority well illustrates the dynamically influential factor of race.

There are estimated to be at least three million immigrants from Africa, Asia and the West Indies in Britain (more likely double that figure), and more are arriving every day as more are being born every day. Already immigrant leaders are boasting that parts of the National Health Service and the transport system cannot operate without immigrant labour. There have been special acts of parliament to safeguard their "rights". Every time an immigrant leader claims that a member of his tribe has suffered an injustice politicians, press men, social workers and police chiefs all rush to soothe his fears. Coloured immi-



New blood or genetic degeneration?

grants are already having a major effect on life in this country and their numbers and influence are such that they are bound to have a much greater, indeed catastrophic effect in the future.

Unless National Front policies of stopping immigration and starting repatriation are adopted Britain faces many years of friction and violence and the certainty of becoming a radically and irreversibly altered country in future centuries. There are many mentally sick integrationists who will welcome the latter fact as they are of the opinion that Britain "could do with some new blood". But these people should consider not only that their views are held by the majority to be repugnant, but that they can only result in further friction, and will bring about permanent genetic degeneration.

It seems surprising that successive Labour and Conservative governments have not realised the results of their disastrous immigration policies and tried to reverse them. The answer is that they have, and the real reason for the setting up of the Race Relations industry is not to counteract "racist" propaganda but to desperately try and stave off the inevitable racial conflict. There are certainly some who are not wholly committed multi-racialists, but who simply lack the courage to brave hysterical liberal opinion and stop immigration and start repatriation.

TROUBLESHOOTING SCOOP

SPEARHEAD rarely pats itself on the back. We feel justified, however, in bringing our readers' attention to the remarkably accurate detective work of our Contributing Editor, Martin Webster, in his investigations of the Zionist conspiracy in Britain.

In the June/July issue of *Spearhead*, Martin Webster contributed a lengthy analysis of this conspiracy entitled "Zionists Run Biggest 'Dirty Tricks' Operation in Britain". In this article, written on the 19th May, Mr Webster uncovered the murky doings of a Zionist agent who called himself "John Cooper", and who had concocted a smear story against the Chilean embassy for London Weekend television at the behest of

Zionist agent Gerry Gable. Mr Webster expressed the view that both "John Cooper" and a certain Leslie Wooler (who infiltrated the Monday Club on behalf of Gable) were one and the same person.

Mr Webster also commented on the magazine *Liberty*, which Wooler alias Cooper published in support of his organisation, "Democratic Alliance", at the time of his Monday Club infiltration: "It was no doubt space in this magazine which he tried to sell to the Chileans when he first visited their embassy".

Two weeks later these facts were proved correct to the last detail. The June issue of the magazine *Chile Today* contained

a Declaration by the Chilean Ambassador, Mr Kaare Olsen, which refuted the London Weekend smear programme concocted by its "research journalist" Gable. Said Mr Olsen: "I cannot understand what has caused Mr Wooler, who has been called John Cooper in the programme, to make these preposterous allegations".

Mr Olsen also stated: "Mr Leslie Wooler is known to this Embassy in the following circumstances. He first came in February 1974 and said that he represented an organisation called Democratic Alliance, an anti-extremist body which published a periodical called *Liberty* . . . he asked for money for the editorial space . . ."

VOICES OF ANTI-PATRIOTISM

"There is not the slightest trace of doubt that their ideology comes straight from *Mein Kampf* and is based on adoration of Hitler.

"What is happening now is a window-dressing exercise to cover up the past record of neo-Nazi activity and to derive power from the immigrant question. The thing we fear most is that just as Hitler took the Jewish question on to the streets of Germany so will the National Front take the immigrant question away from Parliament on to the streets.

Dr. Jacob Gewirtz
(Board of Deputies)

Reprinted here are the comments of three people quoted in an anti-National Front smear article published in the *Times* (2.7.76). They speak for themselves.

He says there is no doubt that the inner core of the Front is nazi-oriented. "This is as clear as the light of day to anyone who takes the trouble to read some of their writings."

Paul Rose
MP

"John Tyndall has told me, and you must understand that I got to know him very well, that his plans are to use the immigrant issue to gain power and then to get rid of the race he hates most, the Jews.

"The democratic principle they now pretend to follow is simply a façade. If the Front ever got power they would never let it go, they would take over the country. Tyndall's wildest dream is to flatten part of the centre of London and make it one big parade ground with government offices all round the edge. He would have 2,000 troops permanently marching around it, so no matter what government building he was in, he could come out on to the balcony and take the salute.

"All this is well hidden from the bulk of Front members, Tyndall has realized that wearing Nazi uniforms is not politically wise. They are now saying that all these early activities were the indiscretion of youth, and that it is all changed. But believe me, it is all still there."

Kingsley Read

SPEARHEAD FUND

SPEARHEAD is not at the moment able to be self-supporting; it needs voluntary contributions over and above income from sales and subscriptions in order to meet running costs.

Your help would be greatly appreciated. Please make out your postal orders or cheques to *Spearhead*, and send them to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middx.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):


British Isles:	£2.58
Overseas surface mail:	£2.52 unsealed
	£4.68 sealed
Overseas air mail:	£4.74 Canada, U.S.A., S. America,
(unsealed)	Africa, Middle East
	£5.34 Australia, New Zealand,
	Far East

Discounts can be obtained for bulk purchases as follows: -

20-49 copies:	11p each
50-99 copies:	9p each
100-249 copies:	8p each
250 copies and over:	6p each

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex.



squealing against us. It only proves that we are well on the way to steamrolling the whole putrescent lot of them and freeing our country from their control.

C. KUKLA,
Manchester, Lancs.

SIR: If Robert Relf was prosecuted by the Race Board on account of his sign saying "For Sale to an English Family Only", it is an implicit recognition by the Race Board that the blacks are not "English".

I thought the race-mixers always told us they were "black Englishmen".

R. DAVIES,
London, S.W.16.

SIR: Martin Webster's exposés of the media are a constant revelation. What a mine of

information for historians in the future.

ROBERT LEE,
Westwood Hill, S.E.26.

SIR: In his *Trouble Shooting* column of the April edition of *Spearhead* Martin Webster asked where the National Front's shock-troops were coming from.

I have enclosed a copy of the *Leicester Mercury* which has a photograph of several hundred White Whitsun school leavers queuing at the Youth Employment Labour Exchange, all of whom are forced to compete with Blacks and Asians for work. Obviously, in the current economic climate their chances of finding employment are negligible.

Need I say more?

M. HARRISON,
Humberstone, Leicester.

SIR: We can only feel a real sense of attainment following the release from prison of Robert Relf, without apology to the Court, or removal of his sign. Perhaps this is the first welcome crack in the hated Race Relations Act.

As Southall (of recent fame) is my home town, now sadly under alien occupation, how galling it is to hear them refer to "our town" and "our country".

The sanctimonious claptrap mouthed by so many to assure the invaders they are loved and will be protected, is made even more monstrous by that enemy of the indigenous British, Mr Sydney Bidwell, Labour MP for Southall.

Criticizing Mr Relf, Bidwell asks: "What happens now if a black Englishman came along and wishes to purchase the house? Will he be given preference over Scotsmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen?"

Does not Bidwell realise that a British passport does not make a coloured man "English" anymore than does it a Jew, German or Chinaman.

My solicitor friend of school days in Southall tells me that Sydney was not so colour blind many years ago when he lived in Cherry Avenue off Beaconsfield Road, Southall.

As the first Asian family moved into Cherry Avenue, who was the first white to rush to him to sell his house and get away? Why Mr Sydney Bidwell, of course, now Labour MP for Southall by Asian patronage.

I wonder what they would do at the next election if they knew?

TOM PAYNE,
Twickenham, Middx.

SIR: I hear that we have been condemned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Donald Coggan, who says we are a "disgrace to the Nation" and any Christians who march with us should be ashamed of themselves.

I think we should feel very proud that the whole rotten and corrupt Establishment, from the Bolsheviks right through to the Tories and the now sick, decadent Church of England hierarchy has condemned us and is



Unemployed White youth: the photo in the *Leicester Mercury*.

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Spearhead publishes the best letter to the press on National Front policy every month. Send your cutting to us not later than the 15th of the previous month. You could win a £1 Nationalist Books voucher. This month's winner (below) was published in the *Accrington Observer*.

Sir—Mr D Harling (Letters, 8/5/76), says that if I am going to attack the left then I "must accept some retaliation". In- deed, I not only expect it, I welcome it. Thank goodness, despite the iniquitous Race Relations Act and the present Government and its nefarious machinations, we still have the opportunity for open and free debate. Which is something in short supply in Soviet Russia!

However, Mr Harling has failed to grasp exactly why I attacked Communist subversion so strongly and so uncompromisingly. I would not suggest the banning of merely left-wing orientated parties. They are not necessarily a threat to free speech and democracy in this country. Britain has become contaminated politically or economically. This has been proved conclusively time and time again. It is also anti-patriotic "international currency speculators" for much of our troubles economically. Indeed, I have condemned them myself, although the term "speculator" is not strictly accurate. More apt is the term "International Financier", the same people, incidentally, who financed the Russian Revolution of 1917, such as the vast banking complex of Kuhn, Loeb and Co of Wall-street, and who have since then financed the Soviet Union and kept its poisonous and parasitical edifice intact against all opposition.

I think that everyone should consider this very deeply indeed, and look into it for themselves. It is a cornerstone of the history of our times.—Yours etc.

DAVID RILEY,
Chairman, Accrington Branch National Front.

4 Lodge-street,
Accrington.

Trouble shooting

The Zionist-Communist Link

One day somebody with a lot more time to do research work than I have will write a much needed book exposing the myth of Communist and Soviet "anti-Semitism". I am absolutely certain that the much publicised clash between the international Zionists and the international Communists is a carefully stage-managed propaganda hoax — the most immediate but not the only purpose of which is to confuse the Arabs.

The cases of a tiny number of Russian Zionist Jewish scientists or writers who are, it seems, being hounded by the Soviets are given massive publicity in the Western press. But for every persecuted intellectual, thousands — possibly scores of thousands — of Zionist Russian Jews are leaving the Soviet Union every year with the approval of the Soviet authorities. The press keeps quiet about this.

Some of these emigrants go to transit camps in western Europe, and some go to the United States — but the end destination of almost all of them is Israel.

Israel needs this additional population most urgently, for if she can populate and develop the areas conquered from 1967 onwards, then international opinion will find it impossible to oblige Israel to withdraw from those areas.

What is happening, therefore, is that the Soviet Union is providing Israel with its most potent weapon against the Arab nations — a rapidly increasing population. At the same time the Soviet Union is posing as the Arabs' friend and helper in their campaign to contain Israeli expansion!

So by all means spare a thought for the next Soviet Jewish intellectual who hits the headlines in the pro-Zionist Western press as a result of being persecuted (in a very crude and public manner) by the Soviet authorities.

But don't allow your attention to be totally distracted (as the Arabs' attention seems to be) from the plane-loads of Russian Zionist Jews leaving Russia for Israel every week.

Zionist Reds

Continuing on the same theme of how the Zionism movement and the Communist movement appear on the surface to be mutually hostile but are, under the surface, complementary conspiracies, I should like to quote from a letter I received recently from a former leading member of the Monday Club commenting on my article in the last issue of *Spearhead* in which I exposed some of the activities of the Zionist 'dirty tricks' operation in Britain.

In reference to the two Zionist "anti-Fascist" militants Maurice Ludmer (Editor of *Searchlight*) and Gerry Gable (62 Group thug and "research journalist"), my correspondence wrote:

"So far as Ludmer and Gable are concerned they are, as you say, old hands at the game. Ludmer has been associated with Communist Party activities for years. In 1963 he sponsored a Mrs M. O'Brien as Communist candidate in Moseley Ward of Birmingham in the local elections. In 1967 he performed a similar service for the Communist Party candidate Mr. Brian M. Chambers.

"He is a frequent contributor to left-wing sponsored journals apart from his own appalling journal *Searchlight*. In May, 1975, he wrote an article in the Communist front journal *Voice of the Unions* on the "threat" posed by the National Front.

"Gerry Gable was the Communist Party

candidate in the Northfield Ward, Stamford Hill, North London in 1962, and also I believe in subsequent years."

Now Ludmer and Gable are both Zionist Jews who have devoted themselves from the year dot to opposing by all means "extremism", "racialism", "fascism" and, above all, "anti-Semitism". What on earth are they doing so closely mixed up with the Communist Party? Is not Communism "extreme"? If we are to believe pro-Zionist press reports, is not Communist Russia strongly "anti-Semitic"?

The more one contemplates the (seeming) contradictions in the antics of the likes of Ludmer, Gable & Co., the more one calls to mind Winston Churchill's most interesting article published in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* in 1920: "Zionism versus Bolshevism — the Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People".

Churchill's vividly descriptive affirmation that the Communist Revolution in Russia was almost wholly "the work of atheistical Jews" would probably earn him, were he alive today a prosecution under the Race Relations Act!

Churchill felt that Zionism and Communism presented Jewish people with a stark choice. It did not seem to occur to him that Zionism and Communism might be complementary conspiracies.

Killing the Monday Club

Getting back to my ex-Monday Club correspondent's letter, he wrote:

"One other strong pro-Zionist organisation not mentioned in your article is the Trades Advisory Council. This is run by Maurice Orbach, M.P., from an address in Cricklewood. Although ostensibly concerned with the protection of Jewish businessmen in trade matters, I believe it keeps dossiers on Right Wingers and acts in concert with a group of researchers at Labour Party Headquarters.

One wonders where Paul Rose, M.P., fits in with this lot.

On the subject of Gable associate Leslie Wooler, who was involved in the subversion of the Monday Club in 1973/1974, and who later co-operated with Gable in producing the recent propaganda smear against the Chilean Embassy for Thames Television's *The London Programme*, my correspondent wrote:

"Your article about the Zionist 'dirty tricks' operation complements an article you wrote two or three years ago called 'Who is trying to kill the Monday Club — and why?' Both articles are salutary and I can confirm from my own personal knowledge a great deal of the evidence you have adduced about conspiratorial attacks on the Right.

"What is undoubtedly clear is that Leslie Wooler had a vested interest in seeing the break-up of the Monday Club at the time. He took a great deal of people into his confidence giving assurances that his sole purpose in going through Monday Club files was to enumerate National Front members so that, consistent with Club rules, they could be asked to resign. In fact, as you say, he was picking up a great deal of gossip which was used in the production of *The Monday Club — A Danger to British Democracy*.

"So far as the Chilean Embassy story is concerned, I listened to the programme in question and can definitely confirm "Cooper" to have been the voice of Wooler. Wooler often talked of his friend "Gerry" although no-one at the time knew who "Gerry" was. Apart from what is contained in your article, Wooler was not present at the Monday Club meeting on Chile whatever he may claim."

NF Next Target

I am very pleased to note how much interest my article about the 'dirty tricks' boys has stirred up. I have received a number of letters from a variety of quarters giving tit-bits of information which will be followed up. I have even received a letter from a group of young patriots in Norway who say that their young movement suffers from just the same kind of subversion and psychological warfare which we experience. I hope they can learn from our experience . . . I hope we can learn from our experience as well!

It seems fairly clear that the main thrust of the activities of the 'dirty tricks' people is not to make propaganda which would damage us in the eyes of the electorate, but which is calculated to damage us in our own eyes — for the specific purpose of encouraging splits.

There always will be in every organisation, even a darts club, differences of outlook, background and personality. It is the function of the 'dirty tricksters' — with the backing of a legion of political scientists, psychologists and propagandists — to turn these inevitable pin-pricks into running sores and gaping wounds.

Their techniques were first directed to the Monday Club, and the Monday Club was smashed.

No sooner had the dust begun to settle from the Monday Club's collapse, then deep dissension started within the NF, and this eventually led to a split which, while it far from destroyed the party, did inflict severe wounds to the cause of British Nationalism.

I could not pretend that the split which took place was wholly the work of subversive elements. But particular incidents, or rather a pattern of incidents, make it clear that our party did suffer from the subversive activities of enemy infiltrators, as well as ordinary folly.

With hindsight we can see that the systematic muttering and 'stirring' campaigns promoted by these elements within the party were co-ordinated with the main thrust of the main external Zionist propaganda campaign directed against the NF through articles prepared for Martin Walker of *The Guardian*.

The NF was subjected to just the same kind of two-pronged assault that destroyed the Monday Club. Fortunately that attempt to destroy the NF failed. But the 'dirty tricks' team have not given up.

Not long ago *The Times* published a long smear attack on the NF. Assisting Paul Rose M.P. and Dr. Jacob Gewirtz (of the Defence Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies) in attacking the NF was splinter group leader Mr. J. Kingsley Read.

ANNUAL NATIONAL FRONT REMEMBRANCE DAY MARCH

Sunday, 14th November

Assemble near Victoria Station at 2 p.m. NB. It has been decided that the NF column will be too large to assemble in Bressenden Place, as has been the case in previous years. A more convenient alternative site immediately adjacent to Victoria Station will be advertised nearer to the date.

N.F. EXPANDING NATIONWIDE

This year has seen a tremendous surge forward in the growth of the National Front. In all fields, in membership recruitment, in the establishment of new units of the party and in our election results, the National Front is showing rapid expansion.

New Groups of the NF have been formed in Chelmsford, Finchley, Carshalton, Dewsbury, Ipswich, Exeter, Hereford & Worcester, Glasgow, Hatfield & Welwyn Garden City, High Wycombe, Loughborough, Paddington, Sittingbourne, Newark, Southsea, South Bucks., Thanet West, Southport, Edinburgh, Stechford, Rotherham and Bodmin (Cornwall). Especially gratifying is the enthusiasm shown by new members who have formed an NF unit after the impact of an election campaign. Carshalton Group, for example, (formed after the March by-election) has been the fastest recruiter of new members in the London area apart from one North London Branch.

Membership recruitment has reached record levels, with over 600 in the month of June alone. July may well exceed that figure. The previous record was after the 1974 General Election T.V. broadcast, with 400 new members in one month. At present levels we can anticipate 5000 new members this year.

Our recent election successes, described on the next page, are another indication of this healthy progress. Nearly half of our 176 candidates in the May municipal elections achieved over 10 per cent of the poll, while the NF vote in the Midlands reached to

Help this member

At Warwick Crown Court recently, Mr Ron Davison, a founder member of Wolverhampton NF Branch who went to the defence of Andrew Fountaine when NF leaders were attacked during the Coventry by-election, was sentenced to 9 months imprisonment.

It was stated that Mr Davison had hit a plain-clothes police officer, a young man who was dressed as an extreme left-wing demonstrator. He had in fact run towards Mr Davison with a crowd of International Socialists, which he had been "infiltrating".

Mr Davison has a wife and six children. They are going to need a lot of help in the months ahead. NF Head Office intends to provide the family with what financial assistance it can, but they need every contribution that members can afford.

Please help as much as possible. Cheques or postal orders should be made out to Mrs Ronald Davison and sent to the West Midlands Regional Agent, Mr Gerry Oldland at 7 Spring Hill Road, Wednesfield, Wolverhampton.



Andrew Fountaine addressing the inaugural meeting of Ipswich Group.

between 20 and 30 per cent in numerous wards.

These are the fruits of both the new unity in the party after the expulsion of the

populists, and the hard work of NF members. Maintaining this growth is essential to our target of over 300 candidates in an autumn General Election next year.

CO-OPTIONS TO THE DIRECTORATE

A further three officers of the party have been co-opted onto the NF National Directorate. These are Mr Richard Verrall, Editor of *Spearhead* and HQ Administration Officer; Mr Gerry Oldland, Organiser of Wolverhampton Branch and West Midlands Regional Agent; and Mr Martin Goucher, Organiser of Manchester Branch and a member of the Lancashire Regional Council.

Martin Goucher has been nominated for the post of Lancashire Regional Agent. As Organiser of Manchester Branch he has done much to make it the best Branch in Lancashire. It is now in the process of buying its own printing machine so that the Region can independently produce its own literature.

The Region, formerly divided into North and South Lancs, is now one, and Martin has plans for greatly improving the efficiency of existing Branches as well as creating new Branches and Groups in the area.

Prior to joining the NF, Martin was one of the first recruits to Jim Merrick's Bradford-based British Campaign to Stop Immigration. As BCSI Organiser in Lancashire, he established within a few months a dozen new branches of the organisation,

several of which provided the basis of future National Front Branches.

Martin's wife Alanna, who was chairman of the Didsbury Branch of the Young Conservatives before joining the NF, is also a go-ahead worker for the party in Manchester.



MARTIN GOUCHER
Inset: wife Alanna

N.F. VOTE IN THURROCK SHOCKS OLD PARTIES

There are four noticeable factors. These are immense apathy among Government supporters, remarkably strong Tory turn-out, crumbling of the Liberal vote, and more support for the National Front than ever before.

— *Evening Standard*

For the major parties the significant figure was that of the National Front in fourth place after an unashamedly racist anti-immigrant campaign.

Labour is becoming desperately worried that an erosion of its own working class vote to the Front could

— *Daily Mail*

After a series of NF election successes this year, the establishment parties received their biggest shock to date in the Thurrock parliamentary by-election, when NF candidate John Roberts polled 3,255 votes (6.6 per cent of the poll). Once again this impressive first-time vote proved that the National Front is well on the way to pushing aside the Liberals as the third party.

This great success for the NF produced a shock reaction from the media and the old parties. The *Evening Standard* saw "more support for the National Front than ever before", while the *Daily Mail* described the Labour party as "desperately worried".

It is clear that the corrupt established parties are terrified of the enormous potential which the NF is now showing at the polls. The *Daily Mirror* mounted a campaign of unprecedented viciousness against the NF in the week prior to polling day so as to rescue the Labour party. Two hate editorials and a double page smear attack were thought necessary to stop our young party.



John Roberts and wife Rita march with Robert Relf.

ROBERT RELF JOINS CAMPAIGN

Our candidate John Roberts, Chairman of Barking Branch, was supported in the NF campaign by Robert Relf, the courageous fighter against the Race Board. Robert Relf, who with his wife Sadie joined the National Front after his release from prison, attended the campaign march and rallies and also spoke to Tilbury dockers in support of the NF.

The Thurrock success proves the rapidly growing support for the National Front. It comes after a series of encouraging

electoral results, notably the massive NF votes in the May elections and the Rotherham by-election in June, when NF candidate George Wright polled 1,696 votes, only 500

votes short of the Liberal candidate. In council elections in Wandsworth and Enfield recently, NF candidates beat Liberals with votes of over 12 per cent.

Mr Kingsley Read

We have received communication from Mr. Kingsley Read protesting that he did not apologise to the Race Relations Board, as stated in our last issue.

Be this as it may, Mr. Read did give an undertaking to the Board not to repeat in future his action in advising local residents in Blackburn not to sell their houses to coloured immigrants. This was a retreat from all previous promises that Mr. Read had made to the effect that he would go to prison rather than comply with the Race Board's demands.

In our *Spearhead* comment we contrasted Mr. Read's undoubted 'climb-down' with the uncompromising stand made by Mr. Relf against the Race Board. Even accepting Mr. Read's protestation that there was no actual 'apology', we see no reason to alter our view that his behaviour in comparison with that of Mr. Relf was abject.

COMPETITION

HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO APPEAR ON A NATIONWIDE NATIONAL FRONT RECRUITING POSTER?

The NF wants a good-looking married couple (under 30) with a baby or young child to feature on a new poster. The main caption to the poster will be "PROUDLY PREJUDICED".

If you would like to be considered for this new poster, please submit a good black and white group photograph to Richard Verrall at NF Head Office.

The NF Publicity Committee will select the winner, and a special professional photograph will be taken for the poster.

Closing date for entries, 31st August.

LET'S HAVE THOSE ENTRIES. THIS POSTER WILL BE A WINNER!

NEW!

NATIONAL FRONT 'T' SHIRTS

All sizes available
£2.00 plus 25p postage

Send to:

RAY DOWLER,
15 Upper Street,
Knowle, Bristol BS4 3BU.
Bristol Branch Organiser

Marxist maid goes barefoot!

Reprinted from RITE UP, organ of the Cambridge NF Students Association.

KARL MARX was an extreme reactionary who never did a day's work in his life. One of the worst examples of the petit bourgeoisie, Marx never came into any real contact with the working classes, whom he once wrote of as a "knot of asses, fools and rogues".

He relied on the financial support of Friedrich Engels, who was described by the Socialist Guillaume, Secretary of the First Internationale, as "a rich manufacturer accustomed to regard workmen as machine fodder and cannon fodder". Engels employed sweated labour in his Manchester cotton factories, flagrantly disregarding the Factory Acts.

After being kicked out of Germany, France and Belgium (in that order) Marx ended up in Britain, as do so many other foreign parasites. Being incapable of work and unable to sponge any money off his mother, whom he had not seen for 20 years, Marx complained to his friend Engels, at "the fabulous way money vanishes".


But the Marx family did not do too badly — they received (not earned) £610 in the first six months of 1863 — not bad for a champion of the working class!

But of course, we shouldn't poke fun. After all the family had expensive tastes. "The children", Marx wrote, "appear to have inherited a lust for drink from their father. They naturally prefer a bright-coloured mixture. I think after all Bordeaux and port are the best".

But poor old Marx! He was constantly persecuted by tradesmen who actually expected to get paid for the goods they

provided! He wrote to Engels, "I owe the landlord . . . £21. Ditto the greengrocer, the baker, the newspaperman . . . These lousy little shopkeepers are a deplorable class".

Then his daughter's education became expensive: "they have private lessons in the ladies seminary . . . from an Italian, a French-master and a drawing-master. Now I must provide a music fellow". Later he wrote that "the pianoman is a brutal hound" for



FRIEDRICH ENGELS

Marx regularly sponged money off his "rich manufacturer" friend.

demanding payment and summoning Marx in the County Court.

Marx wrote in another begging letter to Engels, "I live too expensively for my circumstances and this year we have lived better than usual. But it is the only way by which the children . . . can make connections and enter into relations that will ensure their future. You yourself will be of the opinion that merely from the business point of view a purely proletarian arrangement would be unfitting".

So much for the proletarian revolutionary, the fiery-eyed mission bearer of the working classes! Marx scorned the

ordinary people, the proletariat. In London he kept a maid, the faithful Lenchen, who had come with the family from Germany. Marx reported that in paying for the piano lessons he has been obliged "to pawn the maid's shoes".

So this was the real Marx! Anyone who thinks that any of this was made up flatters this writer's imagination. It is all true; check it in the published correspondence between Marx and Engels at your nearest establishment bookshop.

Better still, read the full story of what a phoney ideology Marxism is in *World Revolution: The Plot Against Civilisation* by Nesta Webster, available at only £1.80 plus postage from Nationalist Books.

P.S. DIDYOU KNOW?

The founder of the International Socialists rejoices in the name of Ygael Gluckstein. Or rather, he doesn't rejoice in it very often, preferring to be known to most people as "Tony Cliff". This helps him to be looked on as an ordinary British worker.

Looking after the Gluckstein family's interests on the IS newspaper, *Socialist Worker*, is Ygael's wife, Chanie Rosenberg. Rosenberg is her maiden name. She writes in *Socialist Worker* under the name "C.Dallas". Tish! Tish! More grovelling to the natives!

The head of the IS publishing firm, Pluto Press, is Chanie's brother, Michael Rosenberg. His alias is "Michael Kidron" and his wealthy South African background enabled him to buy his way into the IS. And they call themselves revolutionary socialists! Lenin must be turning in his grave.

It seems to be a tradition in the so-called revolutionary-left to give oneself an assumed name by which one can be known to the proletariat, so preventing them from realising that most "revolutionaries" are just foreign throwouts with no real care for the advancement of ordinary working people.

Hence Lenin's real name was Oulianov, Trotsky's was Bronstein, Karl Marx's was Levy, to give just a few examples. Ever wonder why? Or would you like to learn about Levyst-Oulianism?

FIND OUT ABOUT THE NATIONAL FRONT

Send 15p for information pack.

Name

Send 20p extra for copy of manifesto for General Election of October, 1974.

Address

To: NATIONAL FRONT
91 CONNAUGHT ROAD
TEDDINGTON, MIDDX.
(Tel. 01-977 2452)

I enclose